



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

un
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,478	05/24/2005	Fulvio Bresciani	71821	4950

23872 7590 09/26/2006

MCGLEW & TUTTLE, PC
P.O. BOX 9227
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NY 10510-9227

EXAMINER

TSIDULKO, MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of using claim language:

“**comprising**” (line 1) should be changed to “**having**”.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 10, 12, 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: it is unclear what source (claims 10, 14, line 2; claim 12, line 3) is mounted inside an optical guidance.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter “*structure has a treatment that modifies the characteristics of reflection of the material of which it is made*”, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2875

The status of Claim 7 (i.e. if allowable or not) cannot be determined because of the vagueness of the claim.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claims 8, 9 the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Young (US 5.134.550).

Referring to Claims 1-3, 5 Young discloses (Fig.1) a lighting system including a light source [26], which is regular light bulb (col.2, lines 49-66) radiating visible light, placed in a lower part of the system and two optical functions, such as light transferring from the light source to reflector [54] and light reflection by reflector [54].

Referring to Claim 6 Young discloses (Fig.1) light incorporated in the structure of the lighting system.

Art Unit: 2875

Referring to Claim 8, as best understood, Young discloses, that the holding structure has a highly reflective coating (col.2, line 47).

Referring to Claim 9 Young discloses (Fig.1) a lighting system in which a holding structure includes a special material (high reflective coating, see col.2, line 47), light is dispersed along the path of the periscope optical guidance and than dispersed from the reflector [54] also having high reflective coating (col.3, lines 41-45).

Referring to Claim 10 Young discloses (Fig.1) a lighting system in which a light source is inside of the optical guidance.

Referring to Claim 11 Young discloses (Fig.1) a reflector [46] associated to the light source and acting as a first optical function (transmitting light from the light source).

Referring to Claim 12 Young discloses (Fig.1) a lighting system including a tubular standard [12] houses a light source in the lower part. The light source could be replaced through the door [34].

Referring to Claim 13 Young discloses (Fig.1) a second reflector [54] deviating the light downwards out of the pole.

Referring to Claim 14 Young discloses (Fig.1) a light source [26] and reflector [46] placed in a hollow pole having an upper window turned upwards for the exit of the beam generated from the light source and deviated from the reflector [46].

Referring to Claim 15 Young discloses (Fig.1) a standard [12] connected to the supporting base [16] and having a second reflector [54] for deviating downwards the light streaming out from the window at upper end of the standard.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (US 5,134,550).

Young disclose (Fig.1) a lighting system deviating light on the region to be illuminated.

Young discloses the instant claimed invention except for that the shape of reflector is calculated in such a way as to distribute the light according to preset method.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to provide calculation of the reflector in order to obtain optimal illumination of the illuminated region. In addition, the applicant is advised that, that patentability of a product does not depend on its method (calculation is a part of method) of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is disclosed, or suggested, by the Prior Art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Tsidulko whose telephone number is (571)272-2384. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Art Unit: 2875

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for all communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.T.
September 20, 2006



Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800